DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 148 651 SO 010 348

AUTHOR Roos, Patricia A.
TITLE Questioning the Stereotypes: Differentials in Income Attainment of Japanese, Mexican-Americans, and Anglos in California.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Mental Health (DHEW), Rockville, Md.
PUB DATE 8 Sep 77
GRANT NIMH-R01-MH26606-01
NOTE 49p.; Revised version of a paper presented at Annual Meeting of the American Sociological Association (72nd, Chicago, Illinois, September 5-9, 1977); Table 3 may not reproduce clearly due to small type size of original document

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Anglo Americans; Asian Americans; Comparative Analysis; Cultural Differences; Economic Research; Economic Status; Educational Background; Equal Education; Equal Opportunities (Jobs); Ethnic Groups; Ethnicity; Ethnic Status; *Ethnic Stereotypes; *Japanese Americans; Literature Reviews; Low Income Groups; *Mexican Americans; *Minority Groups; Occupational Mobility; Racial Attitudes; Racial Discrimination; Salary Differentials; Social Science Research; Socioeconomic Influences; *Socioeconomic Status
IDENTIFIERS *Wage Discrimination

ABSTRACT

Employing data from the 1970 Census, this study investigates whether all non-Anglo ethnics experience monetary discrimination in employment. Two minority groups at opposing positions on the socioeconomic spectrum, Japanese Americans and Mexican Americans, are compared to the Anglo population. Overrepresentation in low prestige jobs, underrepresentation in well-paid employment, and a lower minority income return relative to Anglos for similar employment are analyzed. To ensure comparability of the three population subgroups, the analysis is limited to California, to currently employed males between the ages of 25 and 64, to native born workers, and to three employment groups: private wage and salary workers, government workers, and the self-employed. Education, occupational status, and income are analyzed. The results suggest that the upward economic mobility of minority group members is limited according to minority status or ethnic group socioeconomic status relative to the Anglo population. Mexican Americans apparently earn less than Anglos because of their inferior level of schooling, while the Japanese earn less because of their concentration in lower paying employment and because they do not receive equal wages in the same detailed occupations. (Author/JK)

Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original.

ED148651

NO

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Questioning the Stereotypes: Differentials in Income Attainment of Japanese, Mexican-Americans, and Anglos in California[1]

Patricia A. Roos
University of California, Los Angeles
and
Institute for Social Science Research

November, 1977

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Patricia Ann Roos

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

SP 010 348

[1]Revised version of a paper read at the Annual Meetings of the American Sociological Association, Chicago, Illinois, September, 1977. The U.S. 1970 Census Public Use Sample used in this analysis was acquired under Ford Foundation Grant No. 710-0370 to the UCLA Institute of American Cultures. Additionally, the research was funded in part by the National Institute of Mental Health (Grant #R01 MH26606-01). This paper has benefited from the comments and criticisms of Jo Lea Gaddis, Jonathan Kelley, David E. Lopez, Jonathan W. McLeod, Tom Owan, Barbara F. Reskin, Robert V. Robinson, Georges Sabagh, J.L.P. Thompson, and Donald J. Treiman.

Questioning the Stereotypes: Differentials in Income Attainment of Japanese, Mexican-Americans, and Anglos in California[1]

The stereotype most commonly associated with the Japanese subgroup, both in the sociological literature and among Americans generally, is that of a successful "model" minority. This perception implies that the Japanese have overcome their minority disadvantage and that their "success" is due largely to culturally-based characteristics of high achievement motivation and determination. The positive stereotypes presently associated with the Japanese imbue this ethnic group with those values most highly correlated with socioeconomic "success" (Sue and Kitano 1973; Uhlenberg 1972; Varon 1967). In contrast to the generally favorable attitudes which exist with reference to the Japanese, the image typically attributed to the Mexican-American population is of a denigrating nature. The generally low socioeconomic level achieved by this ethnic group relative to the Anglo and Japanese populations is frequently traced to an alleged passive character and lack of ambition. Not surprisingly, the stereotypes commonly associated with the Mexican-American population are those characterizations most at variance with the American "success" ideology (Grebler, Moore, and Guzman 1970; Romo 1975; Uhlenberg 1972).

Analysis of previous literature in the field reveals two conflicting models which seek to account for ethnic differentials in socioeconomic success. The first of these is based on the expectation that differences in economic achievement are due to variations in minority-culture norms and values. Popular ethnic stereotypes, such as those frequently attributed to the Japanese and Mexican-American populations, serve an important role in reinforcing this explanation for intergroup differentials. According to this perspective, the Japanese succeed in the competitive American occupational

structure because they have embraced the cultural characteristics of industriousness, hard work, and personal determination (Sue and Kitano 1973, p. 87). Similarly, the low education and income levels of the Spanish population are assumed to be due to their lacking the positive characteristics generally perceived as important to economic success. The socioeconomic "success" of some minority groups, such as the Japanese, gives credence to the ideology of equal opportunity and this "success" is held out to other minorities as evidence that channels for upward mobility are open to those who possess the requisite personal characteristics, regardless of ethnic background.

A second model which appears frequently in the literature postulates a structural explanation for differentials in intergroup achievement, arguing that group differences based on ethnic status may be attributed partially to an inequality inherent in the institutions of society itself. This explanation for ethnic variation in socioeconomic achievement contrasts with the "cultural characteristics" argument. Emphasis on cultural explanations of ethnic differentials in achievement, I suggest, both reinforces stereotypes and minimizes the more important economic distinction between the majority and minority populations. Thus, in addition to concentrating specifically on inter-minority differentials in achievement, ethnic research should investigate the socioeconomic position of racial minorities with respect to the majority, or Anglo, population. Rather than arbitrarily opt for the cultural or structural explanation in this paper, I report evidence that I believe supports the latter approach over the former. Previous literature has noted the income superiority of the Anglo population in comparison with that of various ethnic groups including the Japanese and Mexican-Americans (Duncan and Duncan 1968; Fogel 1965; Grebler, Moore, and Guzman 1970; Poston 1973; Schmid and Nobbe 1965). To the extent that this result is a systematic one, a dual reward system

based on ethnicity appears plausible. By "dual reward system" I mean to suggest that the upward economic mobility of minority group members is blocked or, at the minimum, limited by virtue of their race/ethnic differentiation from Anglo society.[2] This paper will document the existence of a dual reward structure, thereby providing support for the structural argument that societal institutions function systematically to obstruct the mobility of racial subgroups.

PREVIOUS RESEARCH

The remarkable success of Japanese-Americans has been noted in many recent sociological works. Levine and Montero (1973, pp. 34-35) describe the tremendous gains in educational, occupational, and economic mobility of the Japanese since World War II. Using 1960 Census data they show that the median income of the Japanese, although less than that of the Anglos, was the highest of any nonwhite group; additionally, the median number of years of education achieved by the Japanese actually surpassed that of the white population. Varon (1967, p. 816) cites the advances in median education levels and also reports the rise in numbers of Japanese in professional occupations: in 1950, in comparison with the white population, the Japanese had 4 percent less of their employed labor force in professional occupations; by 1960, the Japanese percentage in the professions exceeded that of Anglos by 8 percent. More recently, Uhlenberg (1972, p. 127) attempts to explain differentials in socioeconomic achievement between the Japanese and Mexican-Americans with reference to ethnic differences in family size, family stability, and family formation. He concludes that the different demographic patterns of the two ethnic groups may explain, at least partially, some of the greater Japanese success.

In view of the rapid upward mobility of the Japanese, Varon suggests (and others agree that the Japanese should not even be viewed as a minority group:

> In view of these findings it seems incongruous to apply the term "minority" to the Japanese Americans. . . [if by minority we imply], in the words of Louis Wirth, "The existence of a corresponding dominant group enjoying higher social status and greater privileges. Minority status carried with it the exclusion from full participation in the life of the society." . . . By these criteria [of education and occupation], the Japanese Americans have overcome their minority status and participate successfully in the economic life of the general population (Varon 1967, p. 817).

There is no doubt that the Japanese have overcome many obstacles. Large numbers who arrived during the peak immigration years of 1901 to 1908 were initially employed in agricultural labor, a choice dictated by the U.S. labor-market requirements of the time. The seasonal and migratory character of their rural employment isolated the Japanese from the majority population, inhibiting their rapid assimilation into American society.[3] Their separateness from Anglo society was also encouraged both by their distinct appearance and culture and by their tendency to view their stay in the United States as temporary.[4] As a result of this differentiation from the more common Euro-American stock, the Japanese found themselves the victims of blatant, as well as subtle, discrimination. They encountered racially-discriminatory laws, especially the Alien Land Act of 1913, prohibiting land ownership by Asians. The development of self-employment among the Japanese, although supported by cultural preferences, can be viewed as a direct response to the majority discrimination they experienced (Daniels 1974, p. 11; Light 1972, p. 10). In 1924, hostility to immigrants generally and Asians in particular increased

to the extent that the federal government enacted the Immigration Act which functionally excluded all Asian migrants. Anti-Japanese sentiment surfaced again following the World War II Japanese government attack on Pearl Harbor, which prompted the United States government to imprison and impound the property of all West Coast residents of Japanese descent for the duration of the war. The government seizure of their property left the Japanese in both a psychologically and financially weakened position following the war (Broom and Riemer 1949; Thomas 1956). In spite of these obstacles to their upward advancement, by 1960 the Japanese had surpassed all other nonwhite groups in their socioeconomic achievement (Schmid and Nobbe 1965). There is presently a need, however, for research which goes beyond the mere recitation and description of the Japanese success relative to that of other racial/ethnic groups and focuses more specifically on majority-minority comparisons.[5]

Some researchers have begun to question the generally positive stereotypes of the Japanese-Americans (Fogel 1965, pp. 10-15; Kitano and Sue 1973; Schmid and Nobbe 1965; Sue and Kitano 1973). Kitano and Sue, in a recent analysis of Asian stereotypes, persuasively question the "model minority" status of Asian Americans:

> Asians have made enormous strides in society but the notion that they are satisfied and are successful is questionable. Prejudice and discrimination are much more subtle today and expectations are much higher . . . "success" is a difficult concept to measure (Kitano and Sue 1973, p. 9).

The empirical studies that go beyond citing educational and occupational gains note that in comparison with whites, the Japanese have a lower income return for their educational achievements. Schmid and Nobbe show that, despite their higher education level, the Japanese earn a lower average income than whites:

> Although both Japanese and Chinese outrank Caucasians on the occupation dimension, and Japanese are above Caucasians in educational status, they rank second and third, respectively, in income. Apparently, members of nonwhite minorities are paid less for the same services than are members of the white majority (Schmid and Nobbe 1965, p. 918).

If the Japanese are assimilated to the extent suggested by the popular stereotypes, it is important to determine why they are not receiving monetary rewards commensurate with their educational training and occupation level. A partial answer to this question lies in the fact that, despite the popular notion of the successful Asian, the Japanese may be subjected to occupational and financial discrimination which denies them equal pay for equivalent work. Additionally, perhaps the kind of jobs in which the Japanese are employed or where they work may influence their earned income. Certainly, there is a basis for this assumption, given the discrimination they have faced historically, yet the research on the Japanese generally fails to test these crucial possibilities.

Similarly, researchers have begun to question the stereotypes associated with the Mexican-American population. Grebler, Moore, and Guzman (1970) challenge the perception of the present-day Mexican-Americans as being primarily a rural population. Like the Japanese, many of the Mexican immigrants who arrived in large numbers during the 1920's were employed initially in agricultural occupations.[6] Despite this initial concentration in rural areas, by 1960 four-fifths of the Mexican-American population lived in urban areas, a figure similar to that of the Anglo populace (Grebler, Moore, and Guzman 1970, p. 16).

The most interesting challenge to the existing stereotypes of the Mexican-Americans relates to their comparison with the Japanese population. Given the

popular images of the two ethnic groups, one would expect that the Japanese would rank higher on every indicator of socioeconomic achievement. This appears to be the case when one compares the two ethnic groups with respect to the median number of years of education, position in the occupational structure, and median income. However, using 1960 Census data, Grebler, Moore, and Guzman (1970, p. 197) show that adjusting income to take into account the substantial differences in educational achievement between the Japanese and the Mexican-Americans reverses the relative income positions of the two groups. This result is striking and, if supported by more recent data and sophisticated analysis, might lead one to question the respective stereotypes associated with the two populations. However, one factor in particular makes this result problematic: the authors in this particular analysis, fail to distinguish between native-born and foreign-born Mexican-Americans, a crucial distinction given the substantial difference in the educational achievements of the two Mexican groups (Grebler, Moore, and Guzman 1970, p. 147; Lopez and Sabagh Forthcoming). The level of education of those who grew up in Mexico is not directly comparable with the years of schooling completed by native Mexican-Americans, because the former are products of a school system in which most persons do not continue beyond the sixth grade. Hence, the more proper comparison group would be the native-born Mexican-American population whose educational achievement is closer and more comparable to that of the U.S.-born Japanese than the foreign-born group. As it is, Grebler, Moore, and Guzman's analysis overemphasizes the importance of the low education level of the foreign-born Mexican-Americans.

Much of the literature investigating socioeconomic differentials among ethnic groups does not employ multivariate techniques which allow the assessment of the relative importance of theoretically relevant factors on income

achievement. The present analysis seeks to fill this void. Employing data from the 1970 Census, I will investigate whether a dual reward system based on ethnicity exists. Three racial/ethnic groups will be considered: Japanese, Mexican-Americans, and Anglos. In documenting the existence of a dual reward system based on an ethnic group's racial distinction from white society, one must show that all non-Anglo ethnics experience monetary discrimination--hence the choice of two minority groups at opposing positions on the socio-economic spectrum: the "model minority" Japanese and the "unsuccessful" Mexican-Americans, whose mobility pattern appears to be similar to, although not so negative as, that of black Americans (Duncan and Duncan 1968, p. 364). The comparison group will be the Anglo, or majority, population, "Anglo" being a convenient label for the white, non-Spanish population. In attempting to document the existence of a dual reward system, one must investigate the forms in which it is manifested. Over-representation in low prestige jobs, under-representation in well-paid employment, and a lower minority income return relative to Anglos for similar employment will be analyzed as manifestations of a dual reward system.

METHODS

The data are from the 1/100 Public Use Sample for California of the 1970 Census of the Population (U.S. Bureau of the Census 1972). Since the number of Anglos was so large, I further subsampled this group, which results in a representative .2 percent sample of California's Anglos.

To ensure comparability of the three population subgroups, I impose several restrictions on the data. I limit the analysis to California, which in 1970 had significant proportions of both Japanese and Mexican-Americans in its population. The U.S. Census reveals that, in 1970, 48 percent of all

persons designated as Spanish Surname lived in California (U.S. Bureau of the Census 1973c, p. 1). This represented the largest Mexican-American concentration of any state in the country. Californians of Japanese ancestry accounted for 36 percent of the total U.S. Japanese population in 1970 (U.S. Bureau of the Census 1973a, p. 1). California thus provides a convenient research site for exploring current Anglo, Japanese, and Mexican differentials in achievement. Restricting the analysis to this one state also eliminates the difficulty of comparing Mexican-Americans in California with those living in other parts of the country. Spanish Surname data are available only for the five Southwestern states of California, Arizona, New Mexico, Texas, and Colorado. Furthermore, recent investigation reveals that substantial differences exist in the achievement patterns of Mexican-Americans depending on their state of residence. For example, Grebler, Moore, and Guzman (1970, p. 217) show that the income of Spanish Surname males in California increased relative to Anglos during the years 1930 to 1950, while the income of Mexican-Americans in Texas showed no improvement. The authors suggest that this discrepancy might have been due to California's position as a large center for war production. Evidently, the Spanish Surname population in California was able to take advantage of the opportunity afforded by increasing production. Since California's Mexican-Americans are evidently better off than those in other areas of the country, my results may actually underestimate the true Anglo-Mexican income differential.

The 1960 Census approximated the Mexican-American population by reclassifying as " Spanish Surname" those persons in the five Southwestern states whose last name was included on a census list of commonly-recognized Spanish surnames. The 1970 Census extended the analysis further and classified as "Spanish Heritage" any person with a Spanish Surname or Spanish mother

tongue. Those persons who report a husband or wife as Spanish-speaking were also designated as persons of Spanish heritage (Hernandez, Estrada, and Alvirez 1973, p. 674). In the present analysis, I use the more restrictive definition of "Spanish Surname" to define California's Spanish population in order to minimize the inclusion of non-Mexican-Americans, a procedure which generally ensures that the group selected will closely approximate the Mexican-American ethnic group (Hernandez, Estrada, and Alvirez 1973, p. 675).[7] I further limit this group to include only persons classified as white, Spanish Surname.[8]

In contrast to defining the Mexican-American population, selecting the Japanese and Anglo populations is relatively straightforward. "Japanese" includes those persons who identified themselves as Japanese or provided written entries that were classified as Japanese. The Anglo categorization includes all persons designated as "white" by the U.S. Census, except those who were subsequently re-classified as "Spanish Surname" (U.S. Bureau of the Census 1972, p. 143-145).

I restrict the analysis to Japanese, Mexican-American, and Anglo <u>males</u>. Given the differentials in the achievement patterns of males and females, most specifically the females' smaller income return for performing similar work (Treiman and Terrell 1975, p. 197), failure to separate the sexes in such an analysis would tend to confound any ethnic differences, and dual analyses by sex and ethnicity are beyond the scope of this paper. I further restrict the sample to currently employed men in the civilian labor force between the ages of 25 and 64. This results in a sample consisting of the most occupationally and financially stable portion of the total population.[9] Only those men 25 to 64, currently working, and having values on all relevant variables are included in the estimation of regression models. These

constraints result in a sample size of 5961 Anglos, 426 Japanese, and 3186 Mexican-Americans.

Age is included in the analysis by way of a set of dummy variables which omits the youngest, or 25- to 29-year-old group. Eight cohorts are distinguished by dividing the population aged 25 to 64 into five-year age groupings. To account for the disproportionate employment of Japanese and Mexican-Americans in agricultural and urban seasonal employment relative to Anglos, an hours worked per year variable[10] and a dummy variable for farm employment are introduced. Those persons in the two census categories labeled "Farmers and Farm Managers" and "Farm Laborers and Farm Foremen" were coded zero on the "nonfarm" variable. All others, or the nonfarm population, were coded one. The propensity for the Japanese to be self-employed is well-documented (Daniels 1974, p. 1; Light 1972, p. 10). This tendency and the possibility that minority members are less likely to work at wage-standardized jobs (where equal pay for equal work is the norm) necessitate a control for class of worker. Three employment groups will be distinguished: private wage and salary workers (including the incorporated self-employed), government workers (including local, state, and federal employment), and the unincorporated self-employed (U.S. Bureau of the Census 1972, p. 154). This variable is included in the analysis as a set of dummy variables with "private wage and salary workers" the omitted group.

Finally, I include education, occupational status, and income. Education represents years of school completed and ranges from zero to eighteen. The occupation categories of the 1970 Census are coded into Duncan socioeconomic status scores which have been updated for use with the 1970 Census (Featherman, Sobel, and Dickens 1975).[11] Income, measured in dollars, is the respondent's total personal income in 1969 (U.S. Bureau of the Census 1972, p. 155).[12]

THE 1970 SOCIOECONOMIC POSITIONS OF ANGLOS, JAPANESE, AND MEXICAN-AMERICANS

I commence my analysis by comparing the overall socioeconomic positions of Anglos, Japanese, and Mexican-Americans in California in 1970, thus updating earlier research on the 1960 Census. Since I want this update to be as comparable as possible to Grebler, Moore, and Guzman's 1960 comparison of Anglos, Japanese, and Mexican-Americans in California, I do not distinguish between native and foreign-born groups in the initial analysis. Table 1 presents the mean education and income levels for each of the three ethnic groups in 1970. The data show no substantial changes in the relative gross

[Table 1 about here]

education and income positions of the three ethnic groups since 1960. The Spanish Surname group had the lowest education level, averaging a full three years behind the Anglo group. The Japanese were, on the average, the most educated, surpassing even Anglos in their educational attainment. The data on income, however, show a different ordering from that for education. Both the Japanese and Spanish Surname males averaged less total income in 1970 than the majority Anglo group. Despite their higher education level, the Japanese earned, on the average, 93 percent of what Anglos received in 1970. The lower average educational achievement of the Mexican-Americans in 1970 is reflected in their earning only 68 percent of the Anglo wage.

Hypothetically, it would be interesting to determine how much of the Anglo-minority income differential is due to educational differences among the populations and how much can be attributed to other factors, including wage discrimination. The final figures presented in Table 1 provide an approximate answer to this question (see Table 1 notes for a description of the

TABLE 1

MEAN INCOME, MEAN NUMBER OF SCHOOL YEARS COMPLETED

AND INCOME ADJUSTED FOR AGE AND EDUCATIONAL DIFFERENCES OF

ANGLO, JAPANESE AND SPANISH SURNAME MALES AGE 25 TO 64 IN CALIFORNIA, 1970[a]

	Anglo	Japanese	Spanish Surname
Mean school years	12.5	13.2	9.6
Age-adjusted mean school years[b]	12.5	13.1	9.4
N	(7280)	(479)	(3879)
Mean income	$11075	$10252	$7570
As percent of Anglo income	100%	93%	68%
Age and education-adjusted mean income[c]	$11075	$9618	$9304
As percent of Anglo income	100%	87%	84%
N	(7157)	(473)	(3943)

[a]Income refers to 1969 dollars. Total excludes those cases for which education or income was unknown: 26 Anglo, 2 Japanese, and 187 Spanish Surname males (.3%, .4%, and 4.6%, respectively) had missing value on education; 149 Anglo, 8 Japanese, and 123 Spanish Surname males (2%, 2%, and 3%, respectively) had missing value on income.

[b]Standardized for age differences among the populations by employing the Anglo population distribution.

[c]Income was standardized for age and educational differences among the populations by employing the Anglo population's age and education distributions, eg. adjusted income for minority was derived by employing the following formula: Adjusted income = $\sum_{c} p_a i_m$, where "p_a" equals the proportion of Anglos in each education-age classification and "i_m" equals the average income of the minority group for each education-age classification. Education-age classifications consisted of 5-year age groupings from 25 to 64 within each education level 0-7, 8, 9-11, 12, 13-15, 16+. The original education groups 0-4 and 5-7 had to be collapsed since no Japanese in the sample had less than five years of education.

standardization procedure employed). The data suggest that if the Japanese and Mexican-American populations had the same age and education distributions as Anglos, they would earn 87 percent and 84 percent of the Anglo wage, respectively. Thus, accounting for age and education differences among the three populations increased the income discrepancy of the Japanese relative to the Anglos, while at the same time substantially reducing the Mexican-American discrepancy. As a result, after adjusting for age and education, the two ethnic groups differ by only three percentage points in their incomes relative to the Anglo population. This result fails to corroborate the contention of Grebler, Moore, and Guzman (1970, p. 197) that adjusting income for schooling differentials reverses the relative income attainment of the Japanese and Mexican populations with respect to Anglos, although the gap between the two populations did decrease substantially, to approximately $300. The analysis suggests two very important considerations. First, if Mexican-Americans were to achieve parity with Anglos in the number of years of schooling they completed, they would significantly narrow the income gap between themselves and Anglos. However, it is significant to note that even if they did achieve the same average education level, their income would remain only 84 percent that of Anglos, if conditions remained as they were in 1970. Second, these data suggest that factors other than educational deficiency are important in explaining a lower Japanese income relative to Anglos. In addition to the actual dollar difference between the Anglo and Japanese populations, there is also the disparity between the Anglo income and the amount the Japanese might be expected to earn, given their higher level of education.

Any serious analysis of Anglo-minority income inequality must also assess how much of the actual dollar difference is due to differential

concentrations in the occupational structure. Accordingly, Table 2 presents, in a summary way, the percentage distribution in each major occupational category by ethnic group. The data show that in 1970 Anglos were concentrated

[Table 2 about here]

in the professional, managerial, and craft occupations. The Mexican-Americans were heavily concentrated in craft and non-transport operative work, while the Japanese were employed primarily in professional, crafts, and laboring work.[13] As in 1960 (Varon 1967, Table 4), the proportion of the Japanese population engaged in professional or technical work was greater than the comparable proportion of the Anglo group. These findings give some initial indication of where the ethnic differentials in income derive. The Mexican-Americans probably earn less because they are under-represented in those occupations which offer a high income return. This concentration in low income employment is most likely due to an inability to compete in the job market because of a low level of educational achievement, as documented in Table 1. The lower income return of the Japanese, relative to Anglos, is more difficult to explain. Their lower average income may be due to their being concentrated in lower-paid occupations within the major census categories or, alternatively, they may be paid less than Anglos for similar work. I deal with this issue in more detail later in the analysis.

A REGRESSION MODEL FOR INCOME ATTAINMENT

As described in the previous section, the convergence of the relative income positions of the two minority populations when education is controlled indicates the importance of schooling in explaining the Anglo-Mexican income gap. It does nothing, however, to increase our understanding of the

TABLE 2

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION BY OCCUPATION OF ANGLO, JAPANESE, AND SPANISH SURNAME MALES AGE 25 TO 64 IN CALIFORNIA, 1970

Major Occupation Group	Anglo	Japanese	Spanish Surname
Professional, technical, and kindred	20%	27%	7%
Managers and administrators, except farm	16	9	6
Sales workers	9	4	3
Clerical and kindred	8	9	6
Craftsmen, foremen, and kindred	21	16	21
Operatives, except transport	8	5	20
Operatives, transport	5	2	7
Laborers, except farm	4	17	11
Farmers and farm managers	1	5	1
Farm laborers and foremen	2	2	9
Service workers, except private household	7	4	9
Private household workers	0	0.2	0
Total population 25 to 64	101%	100.2%	100%
N[a]	(6953)	(467)	(3934)

[a]Total excludes those cases for which occupation was unknown or not reported: 353 Anglos, 14 Japanese, and 132 Spanish Surname males (5%, 3%, and 3%, respectively) had missing values on occupation.

Anglo-Japanese income differential and thus demonstrates the need for additional research. In the present section, I explore these processes further by estimating separate income attainment models for the three subpopulations.

The preceding analysis was sufficient in providing both an overview of and possible explanations for the socioeconomic positions of the three ethnic groups. However, as I mentioned previously, failure to distinguish between the native and foreign-born segments of the three populations makes any results derived from such data problematic. The foreign-born typically have lower levels of educational attainment than those persons born in the U.S., they tend to be concentrated in lower-status employment, and consequently, they generally earn less than the native born. This pattern is particularly well-documented for the Mexican-American population (Grebler, Moore, and Guzman 1970, pp. 147, 218-219, 187; Lopez 1976). In the present sample, the proportions foreign-born are 7, 12, and 34 percent of the Anglo, Japanese, and Spanish Surname populations, respectively. Including the foreign-born in a model of income attainment over-emphasizes the importance of expected lower education and occupation positions of this segment of each ethnic group. Given the especially large proportion of foreign-born Mexican-Americans in the sample, the Anglo-Mexican income difference would be exaggerated unduly if this group were to be included in the regressions estimates. Hence, I estimate models of income attainment separately for native and foreign-born segments of the three subpopulations.[14]

Table 3 presents the means, standard deviations, and correlation coefficients of the income attainment model. These data allow comparison of factors which may affect differentially the earning capabilities of the three groups. Within each nativity group, Anglos had the highest total income,

[Table 3 about here]

TABLE 3

MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS, AND CORRELATIONS FOR SELECTED VARIABLES, CURRENTLY EMPLOYED ANGLO, JAPANESE, AND SPANISH SURNAME MEN AGE 25 TO 64 IN CALIFORNIA, 1970 (FOREIGN BORN ABOVE THE DIAGONAL, NATIVE BORN BELOW)[a]

Variable and Ethnic Group	E	C30	C35	C40	C45	C50	C55	C60	O	NF	C-G	C-S	H	I	Means		Standard Deviations	
															Foreign	Native	Foreign	Native
Education (E)																		
Anglo		.01	.03	.03	-.05	.05	-.07	-.08	.60	.21	.19	-.08	.15	.31	12.1	12.7	3.64	2.90
Japanese		.09	.37	-.16	.05	-.04	-.34	-.29	.77	.20	.26	-.56	-.00	.10	13.4	13.2	3.22	2.61
Spanish Surname		.03	-.04	-.03	.01	-.02	.02	-.11	.50	.26	.15	.02	.06	.27	8.05	10.5	4.20	3.19
Cohort-30-44 (C30)																		
Anglo	.05		-.15	-.15	-.15	-.15	-.15	-.14	.04	-.04	.02	-.08	-.03	-.09	.12	.14	.33	.35
Japanese	.38		-.21	-.18	-.12	-.16	-.16	-.14	.11	.07	.32	-.11	-.06	-.07	.18	.12	.39	.32
Spanish Surname	.10		-.20	-.18	-.18	-.14	-.14	-.13	-.04	-.03	-.04	-.05	-.04	-.04	.18	.16	.39	.37
Cohort-35-39 (C35)																		
Anglo	.06	-.15		-.15	-.15	-.15	-.15	-.14	.01	.06	-.09	.05	.10	.02	.13	.13	.34	.33
Japanese	.08	-.16		-.16	-.11	-.15	-.15	-.13	.25	.06	.12	-.19	-.02	-.12	.16	.15	.37	.36
Spanish Surname	.02	-.20		-.16	-.16	-.13	-.13	-.11	-.02	.00	-.02	.02	.02	.01	.16	.17	.36	.38
Cohort-40-44 (C40)																		
Anglo	.02	-.16	-.15		-.15	-.15	-.15	-.14	.04	.01	.04	-.10	.01	.01	.13	.14	.34	.35
Japanese	.03	-.16	-.19		-.10	-.13	-.13	-.11	-.11	.05	-.10	.14	-.14	.20	.12	.16	.33	.37
Spanish Surname	-.11	-.21	-.21		-.14	-.11	-.11	-.10	-.03	-.02	.00	-.01	.03	.05	.12	.18	.33	.38
Cohort-45-49 (C45)																		
Anglo	-.01	-.17	-.16	-.17		-.16	-.16	-.14	.06	-.03	-.07	.14	.07	.09	.14	.15	.34	.35
Japanese	-.09	-.20	-.23	-.24		-.09	-.09	-.08	.04	.04	-.07	.00	.18	.11	.06	.23	.24	.42
Spanish Surname	-.02	-.17	-.18	-.18		-.12	-.11	-.10	.06	.02	.02	.02	-.04	.07	.12	.13	.33	.34
Cohort-50-54 (C50)																		
Anglo	-.03	-.16	-.15	-.16	-.17		-.16	-.14	.06	.06	.06	-.02	-.01	.10	.14	.14	.34	.34
Japanese	-.14	-.14	-.17	-.17	-.21		-.11	-.10	-.13	.05	-.09	.05	.17	.25	.10	.13	.31	.34
Spanish Surname	-.06	-.13	-.14	-.14	-.12		-.09	-.08	-.04	.03	.11	-.04	-.01	.04	.09	.08	.28	.28
Cohort-55-59 (C55)																		
Anglo	-.09	-.13	-.12	-.13	-.13	-.13		-.14	-.14	-.03	.03	.00	-.03	.02	.14	.09	.34	.29
Japanese	-.19	-.10	-.12	-.12	-.15	-.11		-.10	-.21	.05	-.09	.20	.10	.08	.10	.07	.31	.25
Spanish Surname	-.08	-.11	-.12	-.12	-.10	-.08		-.08	.03	-.04	.01	.09	.05	.04	.08	.06	.27	.24
Cohort-60-64 (C60)																		
Anglo	-.13	-.11	-.10	-.11	-.11	-.10	-.08		-.05	.01	.03	.07	-.04	-.02	.12	.06	.32	.24
Japanese	-.09	-.06	-.07	-.07	-.09	-.06	-.04		-.34	-.48	-.05	.27	.20	-.09	.09	.02	.28	.15
Spanish Surname	-.11	-.08	-.08	-.08	-.07	-.05	-.04		.05	-.02	-.00	.13	.03	.00	.07	.03	.25	.16
Occupation (O)																		
Anglo	.56	.01	.05	.03	-.00	.01	-.04	-.05		.22	.14	-.07	.14	.42	46.1	46.5	24.5	23.7
Japanese	.63	.13	.11	-.01	-.09	-.16	-.10	-.08		.18	.24	-.70	-.10	.23	39.7	43.5	26.8	27.2
Nonfarm employment (NF)	.51	.01	.02	-.03	.01	-.03	-.01	.01		.34	.12	.15	.10	.36	23.8	31.9	18.3	21.6
Anglo	.12	.02	.00	-.01	.07	.00	.01	-.06	.20		.03	-.02	-.08	.13	.98	.98	.15	.15
Japanese	.12	.07	.09	-.02	-.13	-.01	-.08	.04	.28		.04	.10	-.04	.09	.98	.93	.14	.26
Spanish Surname	.19	.01	.02	.02	.00	.00	-.07	-.01	.25		.07	.02	.00	.27	.87	.95	.34	.22
Class of Worker-Government (C-G)																		
Anglo	.16	-.02	-.02	-.00	.04	.04	-.01	-.02	.09	.07		-.13	-.07	.02	.08	.18	.27	.38
Japanese	.23	.06	.13	.08	-.13	-.02	-.02	-.07	.23	.13		-.18	-.00	.15	.06	.18	.24	.38
Spanish Surname	.17	-.00	-.02	.00	.05	.01	.01	-.01	.14	.10		-.04	-.05	.09	.03	.15	.17	.36
Class of worker- Self-employed (C-S)																		
Anglo	.03	-.03	-.01	.01	.01	.01	.06	.06	.05	-.12	-.16		.18	.13	.15	.11	.3	.31
Japanese	-.19	-.12	-.13	-.09	.08	.25	.10	.11	-.34	-.27	-.28		.16	-.07	.33	.26	.47	.44
Spanish Surname	.04	-.03	-.03	-.01	.02	.03	.10	.04	.05	-.09	-.12		.09	.10	.05	.07	.22	.26
Hours worked per year (H)																		
Anglo	.06	.02	.04	.06	.00	-.00	-.01	-.04	.11	-.10	-.05	.12		.26	2181	2129	551	580
Japanese	-.06	-.13	.01	-.14	.16	.16	.05	-.01	-.05	-.17	-.15	.28		.37	2120	2171	594	510
Spanish Surname	.11	-.01	-.02	.01	.02	-.01	.02	-.03	.13	-.07	-.04	.15		.27	1984	2055	602	557
Income (I)																		
Anglo	.33	-.04	.03	.07	.05	.07	.01	-.02	.38	.07	-.04	.16	.24		12102	11914	8935	7706
Japanese	.30	.01	.05	-.01	.04	-.05	.07	-.08	.39	.00	.00	-.05	.21		7913	10890	5028	6811
Spanish Surname	.37	-.04	-.01	.02	.08	.03	.08	.05	.37	.17	.03	.17	.25		6733	8940	3525	5130

[a]This table and those that follow are based on data derived from the Public Use Sample, U.S. Census of Population, 1970. Only those males with information on all relevant variables were included in the analysis. The sample sizes were: Anglos-5535 native and 426 foreign born; Japanese-377 native and 49 foreign born; Spanish Surname-2759 native and 1027 foreign born. See text for detailed description of variables.

followed by the Japanese and finally the Mexican-Americans. With the exception of the Anglo subgroup, foreign birth exercised a negative influence on accrued income.

In attempting to account for these differences in earnings, I estimate an income model which includes education, age, occupation, proportion engaged in nonfarm employment, class of worker, and hours worked per year, the results of which are shown in Table 4. By applying this income model I hypothesize that ethnic variations in these variables account, at least partially, for the large discrepancies in income among the three groups. The data in Table 3 suggest, for example, that native Anglos have the highest occupational status and the largest proportion of their population in nonfarm employment of all three groups, factors which are generally positively associated with income. However, education, number of hours worked per year, and proportion self-employed also tend to be positively correlated with income and native Anglos ranked second to the American-born Japanese on these variables. With the exception of foreign-born Anglos working a greater number of hours per year than their Japanese counterparts, the relative positions of the ethnic groups on the independent variables generally held true for the non-U.S.-born populations as well.

In addition to providing information on ethnic group differences, the means in Table 3 call into question some of the images often associated with socioeconomic conditions of immigrant populations. First, the foreign-born Japanese had a slightly higher average education level than their native counterparts, which might reflect the recent influx of Japanese professionals to the U.S. This result, however, should be viewed as tentative given the small number of foreign-born Japanese in the sample. This educational

advantage was evidently not translated into occupational status; as was true for the native-born group, the occupational status of the foreign-born Japanese lagged behind that of foreign-born whites despite their higher average level of education. Evidently, the new wave of professional Japanese immigrating to this country has been unable to move into the higher status employment for which they are trained.[15] Second, the results suggest that foreign-born whites in 1970 had a higher average income than U.S.-born Anglos. This result might be due to differential immigration quotas in force prior to the implementation of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1965. Prior to the passage of this legislation, persons were permitted entry to the U.S. on the basis of national origin quotas, which in effect created a selection bias for white Northwestern Europeans. These restrictive quotas were provisions of the Immigration Act of 1924 and were based upon population distributions of the various national origin groups from the 1890 Census. The law further stipulated that in 1927 the census base would shift from 1890 to 1920. After the enactment of the McCarron-Walter Act of 1952, many of these immigrants came from the ranks of professionals and skilled workers because of a provision which allowed special entry to those with skills considered beneficial to the American economy. The influx of Jewish professionals to the United States prior to World War II is a case in point.

NATIVE-BORN

The data in Table 4 is consistent with the existence of a dual reward system based on ethnicity for the native-born. The monetary achievement

[Table 4 about here]

of both native Japanese and U.S.-born Mexican-Americans appears limited

TABLE 4

REGRESSION COEFFICIENTS OF A MODEL OF INCOME ATTAINMENT, CURRENTLY EMPLOYED ANGLO, JAPANESE, AND SPANISH SURNAME MEN AGE 25 TO 64 IN CALIFORNIA, 1970 (STANDARD ERRORS IN PARENTHESES)[a]

Independent Variables	Native			Foreign		
Unstandardized coefficients	Anglo	Japanese	Spanish Surname	Anglo	Japanese	Spanish Surname
Education (E)	556	372	363	270	-277	94.6
	(38.2)	(161)	(36.4)	(133)	(337)	(27.3)
Cohort--30-34 (C30)	2087	1750	1047	1641	992	818
	(331)	(1299)	(321)	(1640)	(2161)	(320)
Cohort--35-39 (C35)	3127	2394	1590	3494	201	1062
	(342)	(1245)	(319)	(1637)	(2175)	(334)
Cohort--40-44 (C40)	4059	2710	2301	3877	6350	1482
	(334)	(1233)	(321)	(1632)	(2378)	(358)
Cohort--45-49 (C45)	4132	2967	2841	5006	3237	1512
	(329)	(1181)	(347)	(1639)	(3014)	(356)
Cohort--50-54 (C50)	4668	2506	2530	5543	6485	1540
	(336)	(1360)	(401)	(1615)	(2593)	(403)
Cohort--55-59 (C55)	3915	5403	3736	5684	4067	1225
	(376)	(1585)	(451)	(1616)	(2722)	(416)
Cohort--60-64 (C60)	3853	728	3913	3942	2261	898
	(428)	(2268)	(621)	(1682)	(3335)	(450)
Occupation (O)	76.8	92.0	50.3	125	107	40.3
	(4.67)	(16.0)	(5.27)	(19.6)	(43.9)	(6.44)
Nonfarm employment (NF)	1783	-1389	2435	2036	578	1750
	(635)	(1288)	(448)	(2584)	(5432)	(304)
Class of Worker--government (C-G)	-1591	-1527	-580	-966	3146	815
	(241)	(877)	(272)	(1410)	(2829)	(568)
Class of Worker--self-employed (C-S)	2245	-323	2054	2838	453	545
	(297)	(845)	(381)	(1086)	(2033)	(445)
Hours worked per year (H)	2.35	2.48	1.66	2.62	2.88	1.38
	(.158)	(.665)	(.175)	(.717)	(1.18)	(.162)
Intercept (25-29 cohort, farm employment, private wage earner)	-8556	-4211	-4043	-8803	-2094	-278
R^2	.259	.244	.269	.279	.467	.244
Standardized coefficients[b]						
Education	.210*	.143*	.226*	.110*	-.177	.113*
Occupation	.236*	.367*	.212*	.342*	.569*	.209*
Nonfarm employment	.034*	-.054	.105*	.035	.016	.169*
Hours worked per year	.176*	.186*	.180*	.162*	.340*	.236*

*$p \leq .01$

[a]Omitted category for "Cohort" variables is the 25 to 29 year old group. For the "Class of worker" set of dummy variables, the omitted category is the private wage earner. The sample sizes were: Anglos--5535 native and 426 foreign born; Japanese--377 native and 49 foreign born; Spanish Surname-2159 native and 1027 foreign born. See text for a detailed description of variables included in the model.

[b]Since standardized coefficients for dummy variables with greater than two groups lack substantive interest they are not included in the table.

to a point below that of Anglos, suggesting a negative impact of minority status on income attainment. Although both groups earned substantially less than Anglos, the income attainment processes of the two groups were not at all similar. Referring to the standardized coefficients presented in Table 4, one can see that educational and occupational attainment were the most important factors in determining income attainment for both the Anglo and Mexican-American populations. Hours worked and employment in nonfarm work were of secondary importance for these two groups. The Japanese achievement process was somewhat different. The occupational status of the jobs in which Japanese work was the most important factor accounting for variation in income within this population. Hours worked per year was of less consequence and variation in educational achievement and nonfarm employment was least important, net of other factors. The relatively low impact of education in determining the income attainment of the Japanese is due, at least in part, to an already high average level of educational attainment. Coupled with a relatively low standard deviation, the number of years of school completed by the average native-born Japanese was sufficiently greater than 12 years to reduce the importance of the crucial distinction of high school graduation in explaining income variation.

Turning now to the unstandardized regression coefficients in Table 4, one can see that the payoff for investment in education varies significantly as a function of ethnicity, with both minority groups earning substantially less than Anglos for each additional year of school completed. Net of other factors, Anglos earned an average of $556 for each year of school while the Japanese and Mexican-Americans averaged $372 and $363, respectively. Evidently, Anglos are better able to capitalize on their educational investment than either

the Japanese or Spanish Surname populations. This finding is particularly interesting given the higher average level of education of the Japanese. Despite their success in the educational sphere, the Japanese appear unable to translate this advantage into a monetary reward.

Evidently the primary consequence of the high educational attainment of the Japanese is in permitting them entrance to relatively high status employment. Because of their inferior average level of schooling, the Mexican-Americans lack this access. We know that in 1970 the Japanese had a larger proportion in the professions that even the Anglo population, although their average status was somewhat less (perhaps because of the large number of Japanese in laboring occupations--see Tables 2 and 3). The results in Table 4 suggest that, in addition, the Japanese are able to translate this advantage into income at a rate better than the Anglos and substantially better than the Mexican-Americans. Thus, net of other factors included in the income model, the Japanese actually earned more than Anglos for jobs of equivalent status ranking. This finding, however, gives no indication of whether the Japanese earned less money than Anglos in the same jobs.

Striking differences among the Anglo, Japanese, and Spanish Surname equations arise from the influence of kind of employment on income. Net of education, age, class of worker, occupational status, and hours worked, Anglos and Mexican-Americans engaged in farm occupations were found to average $1783 and $2435 less, respectively, than their nonfarm counterparts. The Japanese who were engaged in agriculture, however, earned $1389 more, on the average, than nonfarm Japanese. Although this result should be viewed with caution given the small number of Japanese farmers, a possible explanation for this finding is that the Japanese who worked in farm occupations were

likely to be in managerial positions (see Table 2). Anglos, and especially Mexican-Americans, were likely to be farm laborers, an occupation which traditionally offers low wages. Another occupational effect unique to the Japanese is the negative impact of self-employment on income attainment. The regression coefficients for the class of worker variable suggest that self-employed Anglos and Mexican-Americans earn substantially more than their wage-earning counterparts, $2245 and $2054, respectively. However, the data indicate that the self-employed Japanese earn, on the average, $323 less than the Japanese wage earner. This finding is particularly important given the large proportion of self-employed Japanese (see Table 3). Undoubtedly this result reflects the historically-based Japanese preference for small and financially-insecure entrepreneurial businesses such as the independent gardener, a preference which as I mentioned earlier derived partially from blocked opportunities for advancement in other sectors of the economy. Approximately equal proportions of the three populations were engaged in government work at the local, state, or federal level in 1970, 18 percent of the Anglos and Japanese and 15 percent of the Mexican-Americans (see Table 3). For each of the subpopulations the government worker earned less than the private wage earner. The disparity in income between the private wage earner and government worker, however, was substantially less for the Spanish Surname group. This difference most likely reflects the low-paying wage-earning work done by most Mexican-Americans as opposed to that performed by Japanese and Anglos (see Table 2).

The native Anglo income advantage over the U.S.-born Japanese does not appear to be due to differences in the amount of time worked. The native Japanese both worked more hours per year than the Anglos and received a greater

income payoff for each hour worked. A portion of the Anglo-Mexican income differential, however, may be attributed to this factor. Anglos, evidently, both work more on the average than Mexican-Americans and receive a greater income return for each hour worked. This analysis may mask a more subtle form of structural discrimination against particular minority groups. In many blue collar or manual occupations, in which typically a large fraction of the Spanish Surname population is employed, the option to work overtime is an important perquisite of the job. Often the availability of such an option is limited to those with the most experience, thereby eliminating from consideration the more recently-hired minorities. As a result, minority group members may average less hours worked per year both because they are probably the first to be laid off and because the option to work more is not available to them.

FOREIGN-BORN

The existence of the same pattern of results among the foreign-born, although not essential to the argument of the paper, would further support the notion of a dual reward system based on race/ethnicity. In the previous section, I suggested that both native-born Japanese and U.S.-born Mexicans earn substantially less than their Anglo counterparts apparently because of their ethnic distinction from white society. The present data suggest that the foreign-born minority groups face a similar, though more severe, predicament. Table 3 indicates even greater white-minority income gaps for the foreign as opposed to the U.S.-born populations. Whereas the difference in income between the native-born Anglo and Japanese populations could be attributed partially to the latter's unique method of income attainment (including an economic benefit for working in farm-related occupations and a monetary

disadvantage for self-employment), the process whereby the income gap between the foreign-born Anglo and Japanese derives was more nearly similar, in direction if not in degree, to that of the disadvantaged Mexican-American group (see Table 4).

Bearing in mind the very tentative nature of these conclusions given the small number of foreign-born Japanese, examination of the unstandardized coefficients suggests that, as a factor in the income attainment process, minority status is more salient for the foreign than for the U.S.-born groups. The income payoff for investment in education differed along white-minority lines, with the Japanese group actually experiencing a negative impact of education on earnings, net of other factors. While the Anglos earned $270 for each additional year of education, the Mexican-Americans earned only $95 and the Japanese experienced an income loss of $277. Reference to the standardized coefficients in Table 4 reveals the relatively small impact of education in the earnings model. Additionally, foreign-born Japanese did not have the benefit, as did their U.S.-born counterparts, of receiving a substantial income return for their occupational status relative to Anglos. Instead, like the Mexican-Americans, they experienced a lower income return than Anglos for their achieved occupational status. The relatively low economic return for occupational status and the negative impact of education on earnings for the foreign-born Japanese group undoubtedly reflect the nature of recent immigration from Japan. In contrast to the agricultural orientation of the earlier Japanese settlers to the U.S., the later immigration from Japan has been characterized by a large proportion of highly-educated professionals (see footnote 15). The present data suggest that the Japanese male immigrant's high level of educational achievement is not paying off, in economic terms, in his adopted country. These well-educated immigrants have evidently been

unable to move into jobs commensurate with their training and, additionally, are not as proficient as the white European immigrants in translating their occupational status into earnings.

Government employment, with its equal pay for equal work norm, provided a boon for foreign-born members of the minority groups. Evidently, foreign-born ethnic group members are more likely to face structural obstacles to their income achievement in the private sphere. Furthermore, self-employment was economically beneficial for the foreign-born minority members including the Japanese; however, the $453 and $545 income benefits that the independent Japanese and Mexican-Americans received pales in comparison with the additional $2838 which foreign-born whites earned for being self-employed as opposed to private wage-earners. Finally, employment in nonfarm occupations evidently yields a substantially greater income return for the white population than for the minority groups.

The standardized regression coefficients for the non-U.S. groups suggests that the relative importance of occupation in the income attainment process is enhanced for the foreign-born populations. The impact of education, so important for the native groups, was of relatively little consequence for those of foreign birth. Assuming that most of the foreign-born were not, in fact, products of the U.S. school system it is not surprising that schooling completed in a foreign country had little relevance in the competition for income in the U.S. job market. Finally, it is notable that the R^2 for the foreign-born Japanese is as large as it is. Almost half of the variation in income of this subgroup was explained by the variables included in the hypothesized earnings model. This result suggests the extent to which this disadvantaged group is determined by factors outside of the individual member's immediate control.

COMPONENT ANALYSIS OF THE ANGLO-MINORITY EARNINGS GAP

The preceding analysis suggested that although both minority groups earn less than Anglos, the specific components responsible for the lower Japanese income are not necessarily the factors which explain the Anglo-Mexican income gap. In fact, the income attainment processes of the two minority groups differed substantially, although this was less true for those of foreign birth. What the preceding analysis failed to provide is an estimate of the extent to which the substantial differences in the average incomes of Anglos and minority group members can be explained by differences in the various components identified as independent variables in the earnings model. One might wish to know, for example, how much of the income gap is due to an inferior level of schooling or to a concentration in low-paying farm employment. Second, the preceding analysis failed to provide any indication of how much of the Anglo-minority earnings gap is due to the propensity of certain minority groups to be segregated into an occupational ghetto, i.e., the likelihood that they will be concentrated in the lowest-paying occupations. A thorough investigation of these issues allows a more complete analysis of the differences in the income attainment processes of the two minority groups. More specifically, it permits an elaboration of how a dual reward system based on race/ethnicity is both maintained and differentially manifested in the U.S. labor market.

The extent to which Anglo-minority income differences are due to the hypothesized factors may be assessed using a relatively straightforward application of a regression standardization procedure elaborated by Duncan (1969, pp. 100-102) in his research on the socioeconomic achievement of blacks and whites. This procedure involves the substitution of minority

means into successive Anglo regression equations of income on a sequentially-ordered set of independent variables. Application of this method statistically removes two perceived impediments to minority achievement. First, to the extent that minority members differ from Anglos on various background factors, the procedure delineates and statistically controls for that part of the earnings gap due to this dissimilarity. Thus one can eliminate the effect of disadvantaged minority backgrounds on income attainment by equalizing the Anglo-minority means on these variables. Second, the procedure assumes that for both groups the effects of the measured variables on earnings are the same. This is of particular importance in the present analysis since the data suggest that Japanese and Mexican-Americans are unable to translate their educational achievement into economic reward as efficiently as do Anglos. Therefore, in utilizing the standardization method, one is assuming, for example, that minorities encounter no structural barriers against their realizing an income return for their educational investment equal to that received by the Anglo population.

The question of occupational segregation of minorities can be answered within the framework of the regression standardization described above. Of interest in the present analysis is whether minority group members are concentrated in a relatively small number of occupations which typically pay less than the kinds of employment in which Anglos predominate. If this supposition is to be tested by the present data, the question becomes one of investigating the extent to which the Anglo-minority earnings gap can be explained by this occupational segregation of minorities, net of other identified factors. To address this issue, I created a new occupation variable for each person in the sample which in effect represents the median income of the specific occupation in which the individual is employed. This

score is based on the median income of each of the more than four hundred detailed occupations in the 1970 U.S. Census, for a national sample of men sixteen years of age and older in the experienced civilian labor force (U.S. Bureau of the Census 1973b, pp. 1-11). Although it might have been more appropriate to use a detailed-occupation median income which originates from the men in the present sample, the estimates derived from such a procedure would be based on too small a number of cases to be reliable. Using nationally-based census figures enables one to estimate how much of the Anglo-minority earnings gap for men in California can be accounted for by the fact that minorities, in a national context, are more likely to be concentrated in low-paying employment. Certainly, this indicator is not a perfect one, given the uniqueness of California's labor force (the large concentration of Japanese and Mexican-Americans in California's agricultural occupations represents a case in point), but it does given a reasonable estimate of the extent to which occupational segregation of minorities explains the Anglo-minority income gap, especially when one views it as net of the effect of farm-related employment.

Table 5 presents the results of the procedures described above. For

[Table 5 about here]

the present series of regressions, I substituted the median income variable described above for the Duncan-Featherman status scores used in the regression results presented in Table 4. This occupation variable is last in the sequential ordering of the independent variables because the theoretical interest in the present analysis is in the extent to which the Anglo-minority earnings gap is due to the occupational concentration of minorities in low-paying employment, net of other readily-identifiable variables relevant

TABLE 5

DIFFERENCES IN MEANS BETWEEN ANGLOS AND JAPANESE AND ANGLOS AND SPANISH SURNAME WITH RESPECT TO 1969 INCOME, BY NATIVITY STATUS; CURRENTLY EMPLOYED MEN AGE 25 TO 64 IN CALIFORNIA, 1970[a]

Native born - 1969 Income (in dollars)

Japanese			Spanish Surname
Anglo $11914--			--$11914 Anglo
-411	(A) Education	1924	
12325--			-- 9990
-208	(B) Cohort	31	
12533--			-- 9959
76	(C) Nonfarm	415	
12457--			-- 9544
-406	(D) Class of Worker	115	
12863--			-- 9429
57	(E) Hours per year	139	
12806--			-- 9290
711	(F) Occupation (in dollars)	118	
12095--			-- 9172
1205	(G) Income	232	
Japanese $10890--			--$ 8940 Spanish
1024	Total	2974	Surname

Foreign born - 1969 Income (in dollars)

Japanese			Spanish Surname
Anglo $12102--			--$12102 Anglo
-982	(A) Education	3142	
13084--			-- 8960
932	(B) Cohort	986	
12152--			-- 7974
7	(C) Nonfarm	179	
12145--			-- 7795
-729	(D) Class of Worker	413	
12874--			-- 7382
386	(E) Hours per year	260	
12488--			-- 7122
2177	(F) Occupation (in dollars)	405	
10311--			-- 6717
2398	(G) Income	-16	
Japanese $ 7913--			--$ 6733 Spanish
4189	Total	5369	Surname

[a]Variables, defined in text, are equivalent to those used in Table 4 with the exception of occupation. Occupational achievement is scored as the median income of each of the more than four hundred detailed occupations in the 1970 census (see text for a more detailed description).

Breakdown of income differences due to:

(A) Education achieved by respondent
(B) Age differences, net of education
(C) Farm or nonfarm occupation, net of education and age
(D) Class of worker, net of education, age, and farm occupation

TABLE 5 (continued)

(E) Hours worked per year, net of education, age, farm occupation, and class of worker
(F) Concentration in less well-paying jobs, net of education, age, farm employment, class of worker, and hours worked per year
(G) Income inequality, net of education, age, farm employment, class of worker, hours worked per year, occupation
Total = Total income gap between two populations (or the sum of A through G)

to income attainment. The results in Table 5 offer further support for the conclusions reached earlier. Both Japanese and Mexican-Americans earned less than Anglos, but the reasons for the income disparity differ markedly for the two groups. More specifically, a dual reward structure based on race/ethnicity appears plausible, although it manifests itself in different ways for each minority group. The data indicate that the Anglo-Japanese income difference is not due to an educational deficiency on the part of the Japanese. Evidently, native Anglos would earn $411 more (and foreign-born $982 more) than Japanese if the former group were to achieve the higher Japanese level of education. Certainly, the Japanese are not receiving the income payoff that they could for their educational investment.

Another interesting generalization culled from Table 5 is that native and foreign-born Japanese would evidently earn $406 and $729 less, respectively, than their Anglo counterparts if they had similar proportions in the various class of worker categories. Substantively, this result reflects the lower Japanese income return for self-employment (in fact, the return for native Japanese is negative). Both Japanese nativity groups had large proportions engaged in independent enterprises, but obviously this type of employment does not provide the same security it offers to Anglos.

Most interesting, in the context of the present analysis, is the large portion of the income gap which can be attributed to the concentration of Japanese in low-paying occupations. Native Japanese earned, on the average, $711 less because they were concentrated in jobs which pay less than the employment in which Anglos predominated. Even more striking is the $1205 difference which remained unaccounted for by the hypothesized variables, especially since this gap is actually larger than the observed differential. Substantively, one can attribute this difference at least partially to economic

discrimination in the job market as well as to factors altogether different from those relevant to explaining the Anglo-Mexican gap. Japanese evidently get paid less than Anglos, even in the same detailed occupations. The results are even more pronounced for the foreign-born Japanese, although the small number of persons in this group makes these results suggestive at best. This subgroup earned $2177 less than their Anglo counterparts because they were segregated into low-income employment. In addition, there exists a gap of $2398 which remains unaccounted for by the variables included in the analysis. Evidently, foreign birth forces an additional hardship on the non-U.S. members of the Japanese subgroup.

The Anglo-Mexican income differential arises from altogether dissimilar sources. The most notable conclusion to be drawn from the Spanish Surname results is the importance of education in explaining the earnings gap between themselves and the Anglos. Almost two-thirds of the differential between native-born Anglo and Spanish Surname groups was due to the latter's inferior educational achievement. The comparable figure for the non U.S.-born was 59 percent. These findings suggest that if the Mexican-Americans were to achieve educational parity with the Anglos, they would go a long way in reducing the earnings gap.

Although not substantively important for the foreign-born, the concentration in farm-related occupations was detrimental to the U.S.-born Spanish Surname. The continuation of the Mexican-American influx into urban-based employment can only decrease the relevance of this factor in accounting for the lower income of this group. Other components were more important in explaining the foreign-born Anglo-Mexican income gap, specifically age differences between the two populations and differential concentration in the class of worker categories.

Surprisingly, in comparison with the Japanese population, a relatively small proportion of the native-born Anglo-Mexican income gap was due to the latter's concentration in low-paying employment, net of other relevant factors such as education and farm employment. This same result was not duplicated for the foreign-born. As was true for both Japanese nativity groups, concentration in low-income jobs was instrumental in explaining the foreign-born Anglo-Mexican earnings differential. Finally, compared with the Japanese, relatively little of the native-born Anglo-Mexican gap, and none of the foreign-born differential, can be attributed to direct wage discrimination (i.e., being paid less in the same detailed occupation).

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

In this paper, I use differential income attainment among population subgroups to measure economic inequality. The results suggest that achieved income varies significantly by ethnic group membership and, within each subpopulation, by nativity status. The most interesting outcome of the present analysis is the support it offers for the existence of a dual reward system based on ethnicity. Evidently because of their racial/ethnic distinction from white society, minority group members are unable to bridge the income gap between themselves and the Anglo population. Even the Japanese, who have achieved the higher average level of education, remain somewhat behind Anglos with respect to income attainment. These findings are consistent with a structural explanation of the Anglo-minority income difference. Although variation in minority-culture norms and values may be a partial explanation for socioeconomic differentials among ethnic groups, the importance of the present analysis has been in showing that large portions of the observed income gap are evidently due to identifiable structural factors.

In addition to providing support for the hypothesized existence of a dual reward system along Anglo-minority lines, the present data suggest that the way in which this unequal remuneration is manifested varies according to minority status or, more specifically, according to the ethnic group's position on the socioeconomic spectrum relative to that of the Anglo population. In making the above argument, which reflects the work of Bonacich (1972) and Nikolinakos (1973), I am emphasizing the salience of socioeconomic position in explaining the differential manifestation of the dual reward system by minority status. This does not underestimate the importance of ethnic status in the present analysis. To the contrary, minority group membership serves as the convenient line along which loyalties are split and discrimination is affected. I would argue, however, that it is the socioeconomic position of the specific minority group relative to Anglos that determines how the dual reward system is manifested in any particular case.

The term "caste" as used by Bonacich (1972, p. 555) appears applicable to the findings of the present analysis. Although she is referring specifically to higher and lower-priced labor, I will employ the term in the context of better paid "Anglo" labor contending with the possibility of undercutting by lower-paid "minority" labor. To counter the price-cutting potential of the minority groups, higher-price labor attempts to exclude ethnic members from particular jobs, confining them to relatively low-paying employment. I would argue that as the caste system begins to break down and minority members enter those professions which are predominantly Anglo, the Anglo-minority income gap does not necessarily disappear. Instead, the way in which it is manifested changes. While in the more rigid caste structure, minorities are theoretically never employed in the same

jobs as Anglos, in the modified caste system, ethnic group members earn less in identical employment. Mexican-Americans and Japanese, according to the present analysis, provide examples of these two manifestations of a "caste" system. Although native Mexican-Americans do earn slightly less than Anglos because they are concentrated in low-paying employment, they experience a lower income return substantially because of their inferior level of schooling and not because of job-specific discrimination. I offer this finding not to suggest that the Spanish Surname are not discriminated against, but only to show that the inequality they experience is on a different level from that felt by the Japanese. As a result of their inferior schooling, Mexican-Americans are employed in blue collar jobs, in which Anglo-minority wage differentials evidently are minimized. One aspect of the caste position, as described by Bonacich (1972, p. 556), is that higher-paid labor attempts to deny the lower-paid group access to general education. To the extent that the schools attended by the Spanish population are of low quality and offer little in the way of bilingual education, one could make the argument that Mexican-Americans of California are being deined equal access to the same king of general education offered to Anglos.

The Japanese, located substantially higher on the socioeconomic spectrum than the Mexican-Americans, also earn less than Anglos. Unlike the Spanish Surname, the Japanese have closed the education gap between themselves and Anglos. The Japanese thus offer more direct competition to the Anglo population, and as a result the income inequality they experience is different from that felt by the Mexican-Americans in that it is more directly occupation-based. A large portion of the Anglo-Japanese income gap can be attributed to the latter group's concentration in low-paying employment, net of education.

Additionally, the Japanese earn less than Anglos because they do not receive equal wages for employment in the same detailed occupation. Evidently, net of other identifiable factors, the Anglo-minority wage differential may be greater for white collar employment (the Anglo-Japanese comparison) than for blue collar jobs (the Anglo-Mexican comparison), thus suggesting an important class distinction. The inequality experienced by the Japanese is one of structural underemployment and minimal upward mobility, at least with respect to income attainment. The "model minority" stereotype of this Asian population, therefore, seems unwarranted. Attention to these kinds of stereotypes does little in the way of explaining income differences and, instead, provides a source of friction among minority groups because of the unfair comparisons that are made. The issue is obscured when income differences between population subgroups are attributed to variation in minority values and norms; instead, as in the present analysis, attention should more properly be focused on the institutionalized aspects of the Anglo-minority income differential.

In sum, the present analysis suggests that if Mexican-Americans were to achieve educational parity with Anglos and were to enter the professions in equally large numbers, they would significantly narrow the income gap between themselves and the majority population. However, the data on the Japanese indicate that even if such a goal were to be reached, the group would most likely experience a more direct job discrimination manifested in their being concentrated in low-paid employment and earning less money than the majority population for equivalent employment.

FOOTNOTES

1. Revised version of a paper read at the Annual Meetings of the American Sociological Association, Chicago, Illinois, September, 1977. The U.S. 1970 Census Public Use Sample used in this analysis was acquired under Ford Foundation Grant No. 710-0370 to the UCLA Institute of American Cultures. Additionally, the research was funded in part by the National Institute of Mental Health (Grant #R01 MH26606-01). This paper has benefited from the comments and criticisms of Jo Lea Gaddis, Jonathan Kelley, David E. Lopez, Jonathan W. McLeod, Tom Owan, Barbara F. Reskin, Robert V. Robinson, Georges Sabagh, J.L.P. Thompson, and Donald J. Treiman.

2. In referring to a "dual reward system" I am specifically not discounting the existence of a multiple reward system. In fact, such a multiple reward structure is theoretically plausible, consistent with my argument, and supported by my data. The case I am making is that, relative to the majority white population, minority group members are not able to attain equivalent levels of economic success for systematic structural reasons. Thus, I argue, minority groups which rank consistently lower than whites on the income hierarchy are suffering the effects of a dual reward structure.

3. This is in contrast with many European immigrants who arrived in the U.S. at approximately the same time and entered the labor force in industrial occupations. City residence and industrial employment are historically associated with upward achievement and large numbers of the Japanese population did not fit this pattern. Additionally, rural-based employment, especially that which is seasonal and migratory, limited any significant access to public schooling, which traditionally has served as an important avenue for upward mobility.

4. For an interesting analysis of the temporary nature of Japanese workers, or "sojourners," see Bonacich (1972, p. 551).

5. Just prior to completion of this paper, I came across an article (Jiobu 1976) which explored many of the same issues with which I was concerned. Although I applaud Jiobu's attempt to address earnings differentials between whites and minorities, I feel his analysis is flawed for several reasons. Most importantly, Jiobu fails to explore adequately the white-Japanese earnings differential, a comparison I view as most intriguing in the present analysis. He concludes his analysis with a statement that Japanese have achieved socioeconomic parity with whites, a finding inconsistent with the results of the present analysis. Jiobu's failure to adequately delineate the differences in the white and Japanese income attainment processes is due primarily to his omission of several crucial variables. By employing only age, education, and a six-point occupation scale, Jiobu omits the variables which I find to be important in the white-Japanese comparison, namely class of worker distinctions and concentration in low-paying employment.

6. Because of their rural employment, the Mexican migrants found themselves in a similar position to that which the Japanese had occupied a few years earlier--isolated from the majority society, they lacked any ready access to channels of upward mobility. An additional inhibitor to upward advancement for the Mexican population in the Southwest was the discrimination they faced in the form of "repatriation" to Mexico. In response to a perceived economic threat, the U.S. government deported Mexican nationals, as well as naturalized or native-born U.S. citizens of Mexican ancestry, during the Great Depression repatriations and the 1950 "Operation Wetback" (Womack 1973, pp. 446-449).

7. For the first time in 1970, the Bureau of Census included a Spanish self-identification question on the full population census. Unfortunately, this

question was included as a 5 percent item, thus precluding comparison with the 15 percent sample questions. The 1971 and 1972 Current Population Surveys added further groups with which individuals might self-identify (Hernandez, Estrada, and Alvirez 1973, p. 679). When such data become available, additional research might replicate the present analysis to determine if self-identified Mexican-Americans differ significantly from structurally-defined ones. Throughout the analysis, I will employ the terms Spanish Surname and Mexican-American interchangeably.

8. This limitation is not a very restrictive one since over 95 percent of California's 1970 Spanish Surname population was white (U.S. Bureau of the Census 1973c, p. 1).

9. This restriction seems justified since I am concerned specifically with income differentials. Individuals are considered "currently employed" if in the reference week they were classified as "at work." Selecting out those who are "at work" necessarily eliminates those persons not employed during the reference week, and hence gives no indication of possible differences in unemployment rates among the three populations. Those persons "at work" during the reference week represent 84 percent, 88 percent, and 85 percent of the Anglo, Japanese, and Spanish Surname male populations, respectively. The percentages unemployed for the three groups were 4 percent, 2 percent, and 5 percent, respectively (figures derived from the Public Use Sample, 1970 Census of Population).

10. "Hours worked per week" was available only for those "at work" during the reference week. Additionally, the variable "weeks worked in 1969" was available only for those who had worked during the 1969 calendar year. I derive an hours worked per year variable by multiplying the number of hours worked per week times the number of weeks worked during the preceding year.

11. The allocated categories of the 1970 Census were not assigned scores in the Featherman, Sobel, and Dickens (1975) working paper. Hence, I created scores by assigning to the allocated categories the mean value over occupations for each major group (i.e. the subgroup professional, technical and kindred workers--allocated was assigned a score by averaging all the individual occupation scores within this major group).

12. Income estimates were made by assigning the mean income values for each $100 interval from zero to $50,000.

13. Gardeners are classified as "Laborers, except farm" in the U.S. Census, hence the large number of Japanese in this census major group.

14. "Native-born," according to census definition, includes those persons born in a U.S. state, U.S. possession, or at sea or abroad of at least one American parent. "Foreign-born" includes those not classified as "native" (U.S. Bureau of the Census 1972, p. 144). There is some evidence that "country of upbringing" rather than "country of birth" is conceptually the more proper variable for the present analysis (Lopez and Sabagh Forthcoming). This is so because one of the explanations for the widely differing levels of socioeconomic achievement of the native and foreign-born groups is that the former is exposed to the U.S. school system while the latter completes its schooling in Mexico. Those born in Mexico but raised in the U.S., although subject to the hardships of being part of an immigrant generation, still have the benefit of being exposed to the U.S. system of education. Undoubtedly, the sample of native-born Japanese also includes some Kibei (Thomas 1956, p. 85). This designation refers to those Japanese born in the U.S. but educated wholly or partly in Japan. Had "country of upbringing" been available, I could have more effectively dealt with this marginal Japanese subgroup. Unfortunately,

census data do not provide this information and thus "country of birth" is used as an approximation.

15. Prior to 1965, Asian immigration to the United States was severly restricted. The Immigration and Nationality Act of 1965 reopened the possibility of large-scale immigration from the Eastern hemisphere with the result that large numbers of Japanese again migrated to California. This law placed limits on the numbers and types of visas that could be issued, but was much less restrictive than previous legislation. Special provisions were made to allow entry for those with skills that would benefit the American economy. As a result, since the 1965 law took effect, a disproportionate number of Asian professionals, especially those in health-related fields, have migrated to the United States. Unfortunately, as the present data suggest, these highly skilled professionals are shunted into jobs for which they are vastly overqualified (for additional information see: California Advisory Committee to the United States Commission on Civil Rights 1975a; California Advisory Committee to the United States Commission on Civil Rights 1975b; U.S. Department of Justice 1969).

REFERENCES

Bonacich, Edna. 1972. "A Theory of Ethnic Antagonism: The Split Labor Market." American Sociological Review 37 (October): 547-559.

Broom, Leonard, and Ruth Riemer. 1949. Removal and Return: The Socio-Economic Effects of the War on Japanese Americans. Berkeley: University of California Press.

California Advisory Committee to the United States Commission on Civil Rights. 1975a. Asian Americans and Pacific Peoples: A Case of Mistaken Identity. Washington, D.C.: United States Commission on Civil Rights.

_____ 1975b. A Dream Unfulfilled: Korean and Pilipino Health Professionals in California. Washington, D.C.: United States Commission on Civil Rights.

California. Department of Industrial Relations. Division of Fair Employment Practices. 1965. Californians of Japanese, Chinese, and Filipino Ancestry: Population, Education, Employment, Income. San Francisco: Division of Labor Statistics and Research.

Daniels, Roger. 1974. The Politics of Prejudice: The Anti-Japanese Movement in California and the Struggle for Japanese Exclusion. New York: Antheneum.

Duncan, Beverly, and Otis Dudley Duncan. 1968. "Minorities and the Process of Stratification." American Sociological Review 33 (June): 356-364.

Duncan, Otis Dudley. 1969. "Inheritance of Poverty or Inheritance of Race?" Pp. 85-110 in On Understanding Poverty, edited by Daniel P. Moynihan. New York: Basic Books.

Featherman, David L., Michael Sobel, and David Dickens. 1975. A Manual for Coding Occupations and Industries into Detailed 1970 Categories and a Listing of 1970-Basis Duncan Socioeconomic and NORC Prestige Scores. Working Paper #75-1. Madison: Center for Demography and Ecology, The University of Wisconsin-Madison.

Fogel, Walter. 1965. Education and Income of Mexican-Americans in the Southwest. Mexican-American Study Project, Advance Report 1. Los Angeles: Graduate School of Business Administration, University of California, Los Angeles.

_____. 1967. Mexican-Americans in Southwest Labor Markets. Mexican-American Study Project, Advance Report 10. Los Angeles: Graduate School of Business Administration, University of California, Los Angeles.

Garcia, Mario T. 1975. "Racial Dualism in the El Paso Labor Market, 1880-1920." Aztlan 6 (Summer): 197-217.

Grebler, Leo, Joan W. Moore, and Ralph C. Guzman. 1970. The Mexican-American People: The Nation's Second Largest Minority. New York: The Free Press.

Hernandez, Jose, Leo Estrada, and David Alvirez. 1973. "Census Data and the Problems of Conceptually Defining the Mexican-American Population." Social Science Quarterly 53 (March): 671-687.

Jiobu, Robert M. 1976. "Earnings Differentials Between Whites and Ethnic Minorities: The Cases of Asian Americans, Blacks, and Chicanos." Sociology and Social Research 61 (October): 24-38.

Kitano, Harry H.L. and Stanley Sue. 1973. "The Model Minorities." Journal of Social Issues 29 (No. 2): 1-9.

Levine, Gene N. and Darrel M. Montero. 1973. "Socioeconomic Mobility Among Three Generations of Japanese Americans." Journal of Social Issues 29 (No. 2): 33-48.

Light, Ivan H. 1972. Ethnic Enterprise in America, Business and Welfare Among Chinese, Japanese, and Blacks. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Lopez, David E. 1976. "The Social Consequences of Chicano Home/School Bilingualism." Social Problems 24 (December): 234-246.

Lopez, David E., and Georges Sabagh. Forthcoming. "Untangling Structural and Normative Aspects of the Minority Status-Fertility Hypothesis." American Journal of Sociology.

Nikolinakos, Marios. 1973. "Notes on An Economic Theory of Racism." Race 14 (April): 365-381.

Owan, Tom. 1975. "Asian Americans: A Case of Benighted Neglect." Paper presented at the National Conference of Social Welfare, San Francisco, California, May 13.

Poston, Dudley L. Jr., and David Alvirez. 1973. "On the Cost of Being a Mexican American Worker." Social Science Quarterly 53 (March): 697-709.

Romo, Ricardo. 1975. "Responses to Mexican Immigration, 1910-1930." Aztlan 6 (Summer): 173-194.

Schmid, Calvin F., and Charles E. Nobbe. 1965. "Socioeconomic Differentials Among Nonwhite Races." American Sociological Review 30: 909-922.

Sue, Stanley, and Harry H.L. Kitano. 1973. "Stereotypes as a Measure of Success." Journal of Social Issues 29 (No. 2): 83-98.

Thomas, Dorothy Swaine. 1956. "The Japanese American." Pp. 84-108 in Understanding Minority Groups, edited by Joseph B. Gittler. New York: Wiley.

Treiman, Donald J., and Kermit Terrell. 1975. "Sex and the Process of Status Attainment: A Comparison of Working Women and Men." American Sociological Review 40 (April): 174-200.

Uhlenberg, Peter. 1972. "Demographic Correlates of Group Achievement: Contrasting Patterns of Mexican-Americans and Japanese-Americans." Demography 9 (February): 119-128.

U.S. Bureau of the Census. 1973a. Census of Population: 1970. SUBJECT REPORTS, Final Report PC(2)-1G. Japanese, Chinese, and Filipinos in the United States. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

_____ 1973b. Census of Population: 1970. SUBJECT REPORTS, Final Report PC(2)-7A. Occupational Characteristics. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

_____ 1973c. Census of Population: 1970. SUBJECT REPORTS, Final Report PC(2)-1D. Persons of Spanish Surname. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

_____ 1972. Public Use Samples of Basic Records from the 1970 Census: Description and Technical Documentation. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

U.S. Department of Justice. 1969. Immigration and Naturalization Service Annual Report. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Varon, Barbara F. 1967. "The Japanese Americans: Comparative Occupational Status, 1960 and 1950." Demography 4 (No. 2): 809-819.

Williams, J. Allen, Jr., Peter G. Beeson, David R. Johnson. 1973. "Some Factors Associated with Income Among Mexican-Americans." Social Science Quarterly 53 (March): 710-715.

Womack, John, Jr. 1973. "Who Are the Chicanos?" Pp. 443-465 in Many Pasts: Readings in American Social History, 1865-The Present. Vol II., edited by Herbert Gutman and Gregory S. Kealey. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.